



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,995	06/23/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030158US1	9828
46797 7590 09/01/2009 IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829				
EXAMINER				
JUNG, ALLEN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/601,995		<b>Applicant(s)</b> DETTINGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ALLEN J. JUNG		<b>Art Unit</b> 3628	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ALLEN J. JUNG.

(3) JOHNNY LAM.

(2) JOHN W. HAYES.

(4) GERO G. MCCLELLAN.

Date of Interview: 27 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-37,46-53 and 55-74.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rao et al (US 2003/0110087 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the applicants' arguments about difference between Rao's teaching applied as the second reference and what is claimed. The applicants' assertion with regard to the interpretation of the term "field" (or a "logical field") were in disagreement with the examiners' interpretation of the terminology. No specific agreement for the interpretation was reached. Additionally, ways to overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection on claim 70 were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/JOHN W HAYES/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628
--